



Task Force on Faculty Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards

Preliminary Summary of Recommendations For Review and Comment by the University Community

April 27, 2009

The following document summarizes draft recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards. Following a comment period, the task force report will be finalized and forwarded to the Provost on May 15. **Faculty, administrators, and other members of the USF community are invited to forward comments between April 22 and May 5** through any of several channels:

- A link established for the Task Force on the Provost's website (<http://www.acad.usf.edu/Task-Force/FRRR/>);
- Opportunities for informal discussions that may be created within departments or colleges by members of the Task Force;
- Direct communication with one or more members of the Task Force.

There are five sections to this document:

1. Overviews of the Task Force charge, structure, and process and of the three workgroup reports;
2. Summary of the Roles workgroup findings and recommendations;
3. Summary of the Responsibilities workgroup findings and recommendations;
4. Summary of the Rewards workgroup findings and recommendations;
5. A list of participating task force members and their respective affiliations.

Section 1 Introduction and Overview

Background and timeline: Late in the academic year 2007-2008, Provost Ralph Wilcox convened a steering committee to develop a task force to define and launch "a comprehensive study of faculty roles, responsibilities and rewards" at USF and issue a report at the end of the spring 2009 term. The steering committee refined the charge and assembled three workgroups to conduct the study. The three workgroups were convened late in the fall term. Overall task force membership was generally representative of the distribution of faculty across colleges. Although the regional campuses and the College of Medicine chose not to participate formally, there was some participation or input by faculty in those settings. Nonetheless, recommendations primarily reflect a Tampa campus perspective. All workgroups obtained input in some form from the broader university community to inform their recommendations. Following receipt of reports

from this and the other task forces, the Provost plans to continue involvement of faculty groups through the fall term, integrating the reports into a common set of recommendations to be implemented beginning in the spring of 2010.

Overall Charge: “To shape, conduct and report on a comprehensive study of faculty roles, responsibilities and rewards at the University of South Florida; to develop recommendations on strategies for bringing the faculty’s academic experience, expectations and rewards more fully into alignment with the institution’s strategic plan, thereby enhancing the profile of USF faculty and academic culture and lending greater consistency with those of aspirational AAU member institutions.”

Assumptions: Underlying both the charge and the working assumptions of the task force was a general commitment to continuous improvement in quality and performance as an institution. Both the university’s strategic plan and its stated goal of eventual AAU membership figured both implicitly and explicitly in the work of the committee. The task force recognized that existing AAU performance measures, whatever their strengths and limitations, are a significant element in national perception of our standing as a university, and consideration was given to strategies that could more appropriately reflect our performance in those terms.

However, the task force also took the position that AAU and other national institutional measures (e.g., Carnegie Foundation) may not fully reflect the qualities underlying USF’s own path to greatness; that the best long-term gains should not be expected to follow from a primary short-term focus on elevation of our rankings on these narrowly defined measures; and that we should therefore treat the long-term AAU goal as both to some degree symbolic and a source of perspective in understanding and achieving the highest possible quality in our own terms as a research-intensive, urban, state-supported university.

Finally, task force members were sensitive to financial and other challenges presented both by our stage of development as an institution and by the current fiscal climate. USF has recently undergone more rapid change, both quantitative and qualitative, than most institutions of longer standing, in the process straining itself both structurally and culturally. Our institutional wealth reflects our status as a young public institution in a fiscally conservative state. Though there are financial implications to many of the recommendations, the task force attempted to keep to a minimum those that seemed simply to call for additional resources and instead sought to highlight opportunities to reframe priorities and maximize use of fiscally neutral strategies.

Workgroup structure and content: Despite significant overlap among most of the issues to be addressed, each workgroup was given a sufficiently unique independent focus to allow more or less independent progress, with coordination provided through task force and workgroup chairs. The table below summarizes the respective purposes, methods and topics of each workgroup. Summaries of specific workgroup recommendations are provided in the following three sections, and longer versions of the reports are also accessible on the website, <http://www.acad.usf.edu/Task-Force/FRRR/>, along with additional detail in appendices.

Overview of workgroup tasks, methods, and products:

Workgroup	Focus	Approach	Recommendation Topics
Roles	The academic fabric of USF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed categories and definitions of faculty at USF and other institutions and impact of use of faculty categories at USF Developed a preliminary definition of faculty at a research-intensive university Obtained and incorporated both feedback from colleagues across USF and input from external informants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit discussion regarding core values and balance among roles Discussion of procedures for faculty classification criteria and reclassification The need for multiple faculty roles & assignments and differentiation of individual roles
Responsibilities	The relationship of individual faculty to the academic enterprise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted a survey of USF department chairs to address current or proposed strategies for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> improving USF standing in terms of selected AAU performance indicators addressing specific questions posed by the Provost Incorporated responses from more than half of the departments into an integrated framework of recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guiding principles for addressing AAU indicators, including general strategic approach, purpose of policies, effort priorities, infrastructure & resources Specific recommendations on strategies for increasing research funding, enhancing research and scholarly productivity, increasing faculty awards, and increasing the number of Ph.D. graduates and post-docs Specific comments on post-tenure review, relationship of tenure & promotion processes to the strategic goals of community engagement and global research, and institutional strategies for effective faculty recruitment
Rewards	Professional development, compensation, and recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using a small-scale pilot study with workgroup members' colleagues, developed a framework for tapping faculty views on rewards as well as "what is rewarding," and conducted a web-based survey of USF faculty, obtaining both quantitative and qualitative responses Reviewed published literature on faculty rewards and scanned web-based information on practices at other universities Generated a critical summary of findings and issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework for understanding what USF faculty value in rewards Principles for determination and distribution of merit-based monetary rewards Rewards considered as resources for enabling productivity, considering both the incentive structure and infrastructure Rewards as symbols of respect Rewards as part of a culture of recognition throughout the university

Section 2

Draft Report of the Roles Subcommittee

Background information about the Roles' Subcommittee's Approach

The subcommittee on Faculty Roles was assigned the duty of addressing the academic fabric of USF, including criteria for faculty status and appointments, structure of academic units; academic culture, principles and values; academic freedom; collaboration.

The subcommittee pursued this assignment by reviewing various definitions of faculty provided by academic institutions including the AAU and the UFF, among others, and USF documents containing line assignments (see Appendices A, B, C, D, and E). The subcommittee also reviewed relevant literature as a context for understanding how faculty roles are defined and operationalized and the impact of emerging definitions on the individuals who fulfill faculty roles and the institutions of higher education in which they work (see Appendix F). The subcommittee's responses to each component of this assignment are shown below.

Assignment	Response
Academic culture, principles, and values	Definition/values regarding faculty roles/values.
Address the academic fabric of USF	Review of existing Faculty Pay Plan at USF; interviews with key administrators; feedback from representatives of eight Departments/Colleges regarding definition/values.
Criteria for faculty status and appointments	Recommendations based on findings /recommendations based on feedback from USF faculty and administrators; interviews with administrators from AAU universities
Structure of academic units	Not addressed
Academic freedom	Definition/values regarding faculty roles
Collaboration	Not addressed

The subcommittee debated several approaches to its work. Based on these discussions, the subcommittee developed a definition that reflects values related to faculty roles in relationship to the University's mission and goals as described below.

Definition of Faculty at a Research University/Very High Research (RU/VH)¹

The fundamental value of a RU/VH is the disciplined creation, cultivation and dissemination of knowledge and artistic expression through multiple modes of inquiry. Faculty members at such an institution are the agents of this process. The stature of a university faculty derives from the extent to which the knowledge created at an institution is recognized by the larger community of

¹ The Carnegie Foundation's highest level of classification for a **Doctorate-granting University** (see <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=791>)

scholars and consumers of new knowledge (in academe, government, the community, and other societal organizations) as central and critical to ongoing effort to further the intellectual reach of humanity. Consistent with this core mission, faculty members often are engaged in addressing issues of importance to the local, state, national, and international communities. Both the creation of knowledge and art and community-engaged² inquiry are valued in their own right.

The stature of faculty members within a RU/VH is based upon the extent to which their individual and collaborative contributions are seen as central and critical to furthering knowledge within and beyond their disciplines, and the extent to which their disciplinary and societal contributions enhance the prominence of the institution as a whole. At such an institution, faculty roles and rewards are tailored to be consistent with this central value.

At a successful RU/VH, this fundamental value is also understood to infuse all the activities of a faculty member, including the traditional categories of research (broadly defined to include a variety of approaches to scholarship and artistic production), teaching, and service. Scholarship and artistic expression represent the knowledge creation process; teaching represents a fundamental part of the cultivation and dissemination of knowledge (publishing and other mechanisms of placing the new knowledge within the public domain represents another part of knowledge cultivation and dissemination); and service represents the direct application of scholarly inquiry through engagement with local, state, and national communities of citizens and scholars.

In a RU/VH institution, teaching activities are infused with the knowledge creation process; that is, they convey newly created information along with the disciplined ways of thinking that are used to generate new knowledge and responsive practice. An RU/VH institution values teaching as a means of cultivating new generations of scholars and promoting critical thinking.. Faculty roles and rewards pertaining to teaching should directly represent this value system.

Similarly, service at a RU/VH institution is valued in proportion to the extent to which it contributes to the knowledge creation or artistic production process and reflects engagement with community members, professionals, and scholars. Once again, roles and rewards pertaining to service should be tailored to accommodate this central value.

Engagement of colleagues to solicit feedback on the definition of faculty roles

Members of the Faculty Roles Task Force committed to engaging colleagues in their respective Colleges in informal discussions of the definition provided above. The Task Force sought feedback in response to the following questions:

1. To what extent does the above statement appropriately describe faculty roles in a top tier research university? Please discuss how specific elements of this statement reflect the roles of faculty.
2. Do you envision USF as having the potential to be a top tier research university? Why or why not?

² The Carnegie Foundation defines **Community Engagement** as follows: the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=1213>).

3. To what extent does this statement accurately describe your role at USF?
4. In the absence of a similar definition of faculty roles at USF, would you support adoption of this statement? To what extent would you expect others in your department/college to support it?
5. Do you agree that USF should aspire to be a top tier research university?

Summary of Responses to the definition: (see Appendix B for complete responses by department/college)

- USF should aspire to maintaining its status as a Research University/Very High Research.
- Resources must be allocated to support research, to recruit outstanding students, and to hire new faculty. If the faculty's research activities are supported, rewarded, and acknowledged by the University, then we can continue to produce good work, improve our reputation, and attract top quality researchers and students, as well as acquire external funding.
- Differentiation of faculty roles may be necessary to reach our goals. As one example, the university might consider a designation such as *Academic Professional* or *Fellow* to create a culture that provides recognition, as measured externally.
- Definitions of research should not presuppose or favor particular approaches or methods and should recognize the value of multiple forms of research, scholarship, and creative activity including the arts.
- Teaching and research on teaching should be valued in their own right. Teaching involves dissemination of knowledge, co-construction of new understanding, development of habits of thought including critical thinking, promotion of social justice, and appreciation of diversity.
- Multiple forms of service including community engagement should be valued.
- Community engagement should be explicitly valued. USF should strive to maintain its Carnegie Foundation designation as a Community Engaged University.

Recommendations

- Because previous overuse of the faculty pay plan has negatively impacted some indicators of USF performance, we should pursue discussion about steps to accelerate use of a more appropriate classification framework:
 - Institute greater transparency with respect to the issue
 - Consider incentives to facilitate reclassification of current incumbents
 - Discuss the above with UFF
- Provide incoming faculty with explicit expectation of balance among research, teaching, and service in keeping with the values statement.
- Prioritize ensuring a sufficiently robust faculty to advance the USF and disciplinary & interdisciplinary missions
 - Acknowledge the need for differentiated assignments and the value thereof in a Very High Research university (RU/VH), e.g.,
 - Primarily instructional personnel
 - Research professor track

- Eminent practitioners
- Observe caution regarding efforts to diversify faculty appointments & reduce proportion of tenure-track faculty
 - Expansion of non-tenure-track positions is a slippery slope
 - To prevent erosion of the value system:
 - Maintain attention to the values underlying the definition of faculty in a RU/VH
 - Ensure that the highest rewards are consistent with high performance in terms of these values
- The issue of quality of teaching is worth pursuing in its own right, despite not being at the heart of the RU/VH definition.

Section 3

Preliminary Recommendations of the Faculty Responsibilities Workgroup

Observations and recommendations in this report are based primarily on responses provided by 33 Department Chairs within USF Academic Affairs to a survey conducted in January-February 2009. A blank copy of the survey is provided in Appendix A, and a summary of de-identified survey responses is provided in Appendix B. **Part I** of the report focuses on five key aspects of the academic enterprise that are reflected in the Phase I AAU indicators. **Part II** addresses four specific questions posed by the Provost.

Guiding principles:

- USF should take a strategic approach to achieving long term goals that are identified in the USF strategic plan, but should not focus on “chasing the numbers” associated with AAU indices.
- USF policies and practices must facilitate, and not unintentionally hinder, faculty productivity.
- Faculty time is a valuable resource that should be allocated to critical academic tasks, and not drained by excessive service requirements or tasks that are better allocated to support staff.
- Faculty productivity depends on ready access to human (staff and student) and material (infrastructure and financial) resources.
- Faculty productivity is best sustained through recognition and reward.

Part I:

1. Strategies to increase research funding

- a) Identify recurring funds to:
 - reward research-active faculty who vigorously pursue and successfully obtain external grant funding by providing salary increments, additions to summer salary while grants are active, reductions in teaching load, travel awards, etc.
 - provide graduate student fellowships for entering students that are competitive with those at other universities
 - provide higher levels of support, including summer stipends, to continuing graduate students
- b) Facilitate the pre-award phase at USF through:
 - funded summer research appointments for grant-writing, particularly for junior faculty
 - faculty seed grants that support pilot studies and interdisciplinary explorations needed for larger grant submissions
 - grant-writing workshops provided by representatives of Federal funding agencies who have knowledge of national funding priorities
 - enhanced mentoring of junior faculty by grant-active senior faculty, resulting in team submissions of grant proposals to secure external funding with increased probability of success
 - funding for faculty (especially junior faculty) to attend national research conferences and workshops
 - increased staff support for grant writing within Colleges

- identification and communication of grant opportunities to relevant faculty
 - facilitation of collaborative research and grant submissions across departments and colleges, including grant initiatives between sciences and humanities
 - awarding of supplemental stipends to recipients of USF internal grants who submit larger applications within one year of the internal grant award
- c) Facilitate the post-award phase at USF by:
 - reorganizing the post-award process to achieve efficient grant management and avoid unproductive use of faculty time
 - providing support for grant management within Colleges to reduce burdens on faculty time
 - insuring that faculty researchers receive sufficient support from the overhead monies generated by their grants
 - d) Institute University-wide policies to support interdisciplinary collaborative research (indirect cost-sharing among units, credit for multiple-PI projects, etc.)
 - e) Coordinate strategic planning between Unit Heads and the Provost for the development and maintenance of shared infrastructure.
 - f) Insure that the research-infrastructure needs of PI's are adequately served by the overhead monies that they generate.

2. Strategies to enhance research and scholarly productivity

- a) Provide adjunct faculty funding to support reductions in teaching loads by research faculty engaged in scholarly activity.
- b) Provide specific rewards for interdisciplinary interaction.
- c) Use a "rolling" multi-year (3-year?) evaluation procedure, based on identified scholarly metrics, to better assess, recognize and reward research and scholarship whose timing is not coincident with sporadically available financial incentives.
- d) Use merit-based salary raises to incentivize and reward faculty productivity.
- e) Provide 12-month (calendar year) salaries for research-active faculty who do not have grant-supported summer salary.
- f) Provide travel funds for research-active faculty to present research papers.
- g) Support colloquia in units where such activity is a vital part of the research endeavor.
- h) Aim for more and higher-quality faculty hires, incorporating planning for associated higher costs and research space. Focus on more hires at the Associate, or Full Professor level, especially in doctoral degree granting departments.
- i) Provide more competitive start-up funds for new faculty.
- j) Develop a plan for legislative requests to build additional research space at USF.
- k) Aggressively seek legislative approval to create research centers at USF in areas of interdisciplinary strength.

3. Strategies to increase prestigious faculty awards, fellowships and memberships

- a) Increase faculty awareness of awards for which they may be eligible.
- b) Provide incentives for recruiting and retaining faculty who have already won such awards.
- c) Continue and expand summer workshops which provide faculty with a stipend for submitting a fellowship application.

- d) Develop mechanisms for paying the portion of a faculty member's salary that is not covered by a fellowship.

4. Strategies to increase the number and quality of PhDs awarded

- a) Given the limited funding available for PhD students and finite faculty resources for mentoring those students, the Provost should work with Deans and Chairs to set individualized goals for PhD programs relative to (1) the number of enrolled PhD students (and full time vs. part time status), (2) the quality of PhD students enrolled and (3) the time-to-completion of degree.
- b) Although the AAU metric emphasizes the *number* of degrees, there may be long-term benefit to USF in emphasizing the *quality* of PhD students over the absolute number.
- c) Allow Dept. chairs to have more control over the distribution of monies allocated to PhD-student support, (1) giving them latitude to increase stipend amounts to attract highly qualified students, and (2) providing them with greater stability of funding from year to year.
- d) The responsibility for mentoring PhD students falls more heavily on senior faculty than on junior faculty. Thus, the accomplishment of goals related to PhD education requires an appropriate mix of junior and senior-level faculty with each Department.
- e) The number of Presidential Doctoral Fellowships should be increased to a number appropriate for USF's size and goals. The number of fellowships could be increased by adding a teaching requirement to the middle years (years 2,3,4) of the fellowship.
- f) The Development Office could focus on gifts/endowments that would specifically fund fellowships, with individual fellowships potentially carrying names of benefactors.
- g) PhD student travel should be exempted from intermittent travel freezes if students are traveling to make presentations at conferences, as such presentations have large benefits relative to cost.

5. Strategies to increase the number of postdoctoral trainees

- a) Facilitate increases in the number of postdocs by allowing departments to have flexibility in the mechanisms used to fund such positions.
- b) Provide start-up or matching funds to departments who demonstrate the potential for long-term postdoc funding on research or training grants.
- c) Provide incentives to faculty members and/or departments who have been successful in funding postdoctoral fellows on research grants, for example through a matching program that funds an additional postdoc for every postdoc supported on external funds. This would increase the critical mass of the research enterprise and lead to more grants which support even more postdocs.

Part II:

1. What form should an effective post-tenure review take?

- a) Given that it would be difficult to imagine a situation in which the post-tenure review could be negative after many years of positive annual evaluations, the two poles could be combined into one: robust annual reviews plus more intense reviews every 4-5 years.
- b) Faculty members who receive strong evaluations during post-tenure review should be rewarded with a salary increase; those who receive satisfactory evaluations should retain their current salary; and those who receive unsatisfactory evaluations should be subject to salary reduction.

- c) A related issue concerns faculty members who successfully navigate tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, but then fail to progress from Associate Professor to Full Professor. Mid-level faculty have the greatest potential to increase the national reputation and impact of the university as they progress in their careers; thus, it is important to monitor and support them during this process.

2. How should tenure and promotion processes encourage community engagement and global research?

These decisions are best made at the local (department) level, since the relevance of community engagement and global research varies according to academic area and program. Higher level reviews of T&P applications (by the College, Provost, etc.) must respect the local criteria.

3. Should instructors take part in the Annual evaluations of tenure/tenure-track faculty?

Responses indicated that instructors participate in the annual evaluations of tenure-track faculty in approximately 1/3 of departments, and do not participate in the remaining 2/3. We did not solicit comments to explain these differences, but there may be department-specific reasons to include instructors in the evaluation committee in some departments.

4. Are there institutional strategies for supporting effective faculty recruitment?

- a) Target high-quality candidates, including established scholars at the Associate and Full levels.
- b) Because starting salaries appear to be less of an issue than benefits, it may be helpful to focus on increasing benefits by including a moving allowance and providing tuition credits that extend to the faculty member's family.
- c) Enhance initial research support by providing increased start-up funds, reduced teaching loads during the first year, university-funded graduate research assistants, and increasing travel funds.
- d) If a department loses a tenure-track faculty member due to early departure and/or denial of tenure, the faculty line should automatically be returned to the unit.
- e) The search process should be improved by:
 - Approving searches earlier in the academic year, or giving permission to initiate a search prior to receipt of full approval (with the understanding that the search may need to be cancelled).
 - Establishing a mechanism for expedited hiring for outstanding candidates.
 - Distributing start-up funds more equitably.
 - Re-establishing an official spousal-hiring policy.

Section 4

Rewards Working Group: Findings and Preliminary Recommendations

Across all data collected, the Rewards Working Group found that USF faculty value four major categories of rewards: **Recognition, Respect, Support, and Competent/Caring Administrators**. These categories are also evidence of what makes USF a “rewarding” place to work; conversely, the absence of these tangible and intangible rewards and resources greatly impacts faculty morale and productivity.

As a “given” in any monetary reward structure, USF faculty overwhelmingly reported “higher salary” as their first concern. Beyond a desire for monetary compensation that meets and/or exceeds national averages for Research I institutions, the Rewards Working Group found that

1. **Rewards should be tied to evaluation processes and criteria endorsed by faculty.** For rewards *as monetary compensation*, we recommend
 - credible metrics for evaluation
 - merit pay based on more than one year’s evaluation
 - not distributing large monetary awards to just a few individuals
 - offering faculty the option of 12-month salary dispersal

2. **Rewards should be evidence of on-going support for faculty research, creative activity, teaching, service, and community engagement.** For rewards *as resources* that enable faculty productivity, we recommend
 - increased incentives to support this faculty work
 - removal of disincentives that discourage this faculty work
 - improved grant infrastructure at USF

3. **Rewards should be tangible and intangible symbols of the respect of administration toward faculty.** For rewards *as acknowledgment* of faculty accomplishments, we recommend that administration
 - recognize and utilize faculty expertise in projects impacting the USF community
 - be rhetorically sensitive in communicating with USF faculty and limit use of blanket, email broadcasts that “thank” USF faculty for hard work

4. **Rewards should be part of a culture of recognition for all faculty work across all levels (department, unit, college, and university).** For rewards *as recognition* in economic hard times, we recommend these “low-, no-cost” ideas:
 - establish university-wide awards that recognize the many ways faculty contribute to the mission of USF, including
 - new research initiatives
 - outstanding mentoring of graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and junior faculty
 - outstanding interdisciplinary collaboration
 - outstanding graduate teaching
 - outstanding community engagement

- outstanding service
- to go beyond one-time teaching awards, create a “Master Teacher” Academy that recognizes, utilizes, and disseminates Award-winning teachers’ expertise and experience
- create a Presidential webpage that features faculty doing things not normally recognized or heralded
- create a web-based clearing-house for all departmental newsletters to better acknowledge departmental and unit-level work and to disseminate these to larger constituencies
- in USF promotional materials, include faculty work from across the university rather than focusing exclusively on research that garners grant monies. This work can include
 - books published
 - creative work produced, show-cased, and/or taught at USF
 - critical work in the Humanities

In support of the above recommendations, the Rewards Working Group has provided the following supplementary materials, all contained within a single file entitled Rewards Working Group Appendices:

- Appendix 1. Framing Faculty Rewards
- Appendix 2. Observations from Faculty Survey
- Appendix 3. Extended Discussion of Recommendations
 - App. 3.1 Recommendation #1
 - App. 3.2 Recommendation #2
 - App. 3.3 Recommendation #3
 - App. 3.4 Recommendation #4
- Appendix 4. Literature Review of Faculty Rewards

Section 5

Participating Task Force Members

Workgroup on Faculty Roles

Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill* (Workgroup Chair, Special Education)
Ellis Blanton* (Information Systems/ Decision Sciences)
Carol Ann Borchert (Library)
Mark Goldman (Psychology)
Pat Finelli (Theatre & Dance)
Michael Lynch (Criminology)
Brent Weisman (Anthropology)
Tom Weller* (Electrical Engineering)

Workgroup on Faculty Responsibilities

Gail Donaldson* (Workgroup Chair, Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Roger Arieuw (Philosophy)
Dmitry Khavinson (Mathematics & Statistics)
Gary Mitchum (Physical Oceanography)
Pritish Mukherjee* (Physics)
Jianping Qi (Finance)
Paul Stiles (Mental Health Law & Policy)
Shannon Suldo (Psychological & Social Foundations)

Workgroup on Faculty Rewards

Pamela Hallock Muller* (Workgroup Co-chair, Marine Science)
Joan Gregory* (Workgroup Co-chair, Nursing)
Elizabeth Bell (Communication)
Daniel Belgrad (Humanities & Cultural Studies)
James Garey (Cell Biology, Microbiology & Molecular Biology)
Vikas Mehta (Architecture and Community Design)
Janet Richards (Childhood Education and Literacy Studies)
Lawrence Schonfeld (Aging & Mental Health Disparities)
Rajan Sen (Civil Engineering)

*** Executive Committee**

Greg Teague (Task Force Chair, Mental Health Law & Policy)
Ellis Blanton (Information Systems/ Decision Sciences)
Gail Donaldson (Responsibilities Workgroup Chair, Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Kofi Glover (Provost's Office Liaison, Government International Affairs)
Joan Gregory (Nursing)
Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill (Special Education)
Pritish Mukherjee (Physics)
Pam Muller (Workgroup Chair, Geological Oceanography)
Dwayne Smith (Provost's Office Liaison, Criminology)
Graham Tobin (Provost's Office Liaison, Geography)
Tom Weller (Electrical Engineering)

Initial Steering Committee (through October 2008)

All members of the Executive Committee*
Trent Green (Architecture)
Patricia Kruk (College of Medicine)
Dave Armitage (USF Polytechnic)